

Minutes of a meeting of the **Planning Committee** held via video link on **Wednesday 4 November 2020 at 9.30am.**

A roll call was taken and the following members were present:

Cllr S Lawn – Chairman

Cllr A D Adams
Cllr S Beadle
Cllr N J Brennan

Cllr R R Foulger
Cllr C Karimi-Ghovanlou
Cllr I Moncur

Cllr S Prutton
Cllr S Riley
Cllr J M Ward

Also in attendance were the Development Manager (TL), the Area Team Manager (MR) and the Democratic Services Officers (TB & LA).

134 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER PROCEDURAL RULE NO 8

| Member | Minute No & Heading | Nature of Interest |
|------------------------|---|---|
| Cllr C Kaimi-Ghovanlou | Application 20201212 – 10 Penn Road, Taverham | Taverham Parish Council Member but had not participated in any meetings or conversations. Non-disclosable - non pecuniary interest. |

135 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on the 7 October 2020 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman subjected to the following amendments;

Minute 127 Declarations of Interest 131 application number amended from 202020200981 to 20200981 and deletion of the reference to Cllr S Prutton.

An additional minute be added to (129) confirming the minutes of the meetings held on the 9 and 16 September 2020. (The remaining minute numbers were re-numbered accordingly.)

Minute 131 (subsequently amended to 132) application number amended from 2020430548 to 20200981.

136 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was received from Cllr J F Fisher.

In respect of the decisions indicated in the following minutes, conditions or reasons for refusal of planning permission as determined by the Committee being in summary form only and based on standard conditions where indicated and subject to the final determination of the Director of Place.

137 APPLICATION NUMBER 20191881 – DRAYTON DREWRAY, REEPHAM ROAD JUNCTION, DRAYTON

The Committee considered an application for the change of use of woodland for use as an organised paintballing site & erection of ancillary structures.

The application was reported to Committee as the proposal had potential to generate employment and the recommendation was for refusal.

Members noted the location and context of the site as set out in detail in the report.

They also noted an additional objection had been received from Drayton Drewray Relief in Need Charity which was part of the supplementary agenda.

The Committee heard from Graham Everett the Chairman of Drayton Parish Council, objecting the proposal. Local Member Cllr Crotch also spoke raising objections to the proposals.

The key issues in the determination of the application were the principle of the development and its impact on the character and appearance of the area, its impact on amenity, ecology, highway safety, the public right of way and the economy.

In assessing these issues, members concluded that the risk to the surrounding area was too great to grant permission for the proposal with the potential damage to the environment alongside the implications on the surrounding woodland footpaths used by members of the public.

The application had not adequately demonstrated that a clearly defined need existed for the facility and the proposal would cause significant harm to the general character and appearance of the area. There were concerns about the impact of the proposal on highway safety, the nearby public right of way, and the ecology on the site. Members considered the economic and social benefits of the proposal and felt these had little weight when considering the conflict identified with Local Plan policies. It was therefore concluded that there were no material considerations to support determination of the application other than in accordance with the development plan.

It was proposed, duly seconded, that the officer recommendation be supported. On being put to the vote, by way of a roll call, it was

RESOLVED:

to refuse application 20191881 for the following reasons:

1. The site is located outside of the defined settlement limit and as the development is considered to result in significant adverse impacts in relation to the harm caused to the environment, character and appearance of the area, the application conflicts with Policy GC2 and CSU1 of the Development Management Development Plan (DM DPD) 2015.
2. The proposed development would result in a substantial change to the countryside character of a site in a prominent location. It is considered that the development would constitute a visual intrusion into the countryside, which would, by reason of its appearance, associated structures and lighting and additional parking intensify the scheme's harmful impact on the rural character and appearance of the woodland. As a consequence, the proposed development would be discordant and harmful to the general character and appearance of the area in conflict with Policies GC4 and EN2 of the Development Management Development Plan (DM DPD) 2015 and the Landscape Character Appraisal, Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy 2014, Policy 1A of the Drayton Neighbourhood Plan 2016 and Paragraphs 127 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. The lighting proposed will have an adverse impact on the identified species of bats (including barbastelles) and other nocturnal species. It is therefore contrary to Policy 1 of the Joint Core Strategy 2014, Policy EN1 of the Development Management DPD 2015 and Policies 1C and 8 of the Drayton Neighbourhood Plan 2016.
4. The proposal does not incorporate adequate on-site vehicular parking and manoeuvring facilities to the standard required by the Local Planning Authority. The proposal, if permitted, would therefore be likely to lead to an undesirable increase in on-street parking to the detriment to highway safety. The application is therefore considered to be contrary to Policies TS3 and TS4 of the Development Management DPD 2015.
5. The proposal does not adequately address the concerns relating to the impact on the public right of way and is therefore contrary to Paragraph 98 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that 'planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access' and Policy 7 of the Drayton Neighbourhood Plan 2016 which aims to promote improved walking routes in the area.

138 APPLICATION NUMBER 20201212 – MARAGOWEN, 10 PENN ROAD, TAVERHAM, NR8 6NJ

The Committee considered an application for the raising of the roof level with a loft conversion, dormer windows and single storey extension to the rear and extension to the front.

The application was reported to Committee at the request of the Local Member for appropriate planning reasons as set out in the report.

Members noted the location and context of the site as set out in detail in the report.

The Committee heard from Mark Thornhill and Peter Elden objecting to the proposals. They also heard from Wayne Hoban, the applicant, in support of the application.

The site was located within the settlement limit for Taverham surrounded by residential properties, where the principle of adding extensions or making alterations to an existing residential property was acceptable. The issues to be considered were the impact of the proposals on neighbouring amenity and the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

In assessing these issues, members concluded that the design was acceptable and the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the amenity of either the immediate neighbours or the wider area. They also agreed that parking provision was acceptable. The proposal therefore met the criteria set out within Policy GC4 of the Development Management DPD, Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy TAV3 of the emerging Taverham Neighbourhood Plan.

It was then proposed, duly seconded, that the officer's recommendation be supported. On being put to the vote, by way of a roll call, it was

RESOLVED:

to approve application 20201212 subject to the following conditions:

1. Time limit (TL01)
2. Approved plans and documents (AD01)
3. Windows to be obscure glazed within the dormer window (P05)

139 PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee noted the appeal decisions received and appeals lodged for the period 25 September 2020 to 22 October 2020.

The meeting closed at 11:15am